



GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND PROGRAM PLANNING

## Fiscal Note 2011 Biennium

<b>Bill #</b>	HB0065	<b>Title:</b>	Fund children management authorities for mental health
<b>Primary Sponsor:</b>	Sands, Diane	<b>Status:</b>	As Introduced

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Local Gov Impact     | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be included in HB 2  | <input type="checkbox"/> Technical Concerns              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Included in the Executive Budget | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Long-Term Impacts | <input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated Revenue Form Attached |

### **FISCAL SUMMARY**

	<b><u>FY 2010 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2012 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013 Difference</u></b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
General Fund	\$1,100,000	\$1,350,000	\$0	\$0
<b>Revenue:</b>				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Net Impact-General Fund Balance:</b>	<u>(\$1,100,000)</u>	<u>(\$1,350,000)</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

#### **Description of fiscal impact:**

HB 65 appropriates general fund for the continued services to high-risk children who need mental health and other state agency services.

### **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

#### **Assumptions:**

- This bill proposes funding to sustain the system of care for high-risk children with multi-agency needs. The funding is to be used as follows:

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2010</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011</u></b>
1(1)	Sustain the 5 existing Kids Management Authorities (KMA)	\$750,000	\$750,000
1(2)	Development of 5 additional KMAs	\$250,000	
1(3)	Sustain the 5 KMAs developed in FY 2010 and develop 5 additional KMAs/Sustain 10 KMAs in FY2012 & FY2013		\$500,000
1(4)	Wraparound Philosophy of Services	\$100,000	\$100,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>

2. The bill provides funding for the current KMAs. The new KMA would be required to apply for the funding through the Request For Proposal process.
3. This bill provides funding for KMAs (existing and proposed) for FY 2010 and FY 2011. It is likely that funding will be requested in the following biennium, but no additional provision of service is required by this bill in FY 2012 and FY 2013, so not costs were included.

	<b><u>FY 2010 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2012 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013 Difference</u></b>
<b><u>Fiscal Impact:</u></b>				
<b><u>Expenditures:</u></b>				
Grants	\$1,100,000	\$1,350,000	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL Expenditures</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b><u>Funding of Expenditures:</u></b>				
General Fund (01)	\$1,100,000	\$1,350,000	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL Funding of Exp.</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>	<b>\$1,350,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b><u>Revenues:</u></b>				
General Fund (01)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL Revenues</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b><u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):</u></b>				
General Fund (01)	(\$1,100,000)	(\$1,350,000)	\$0	\$0

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Sponsor's Initials*\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*\_\_\_\_\_  
*Budget Director's Initials*\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*